

## REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5-9, and 17-20; canceled claims 4, 10-16, and 21, without prejudice; and added new claims 22-30. As a result, claims 1-3, 5-9, 17-20, and 22-30 are pending in this application. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 21 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. The Office asserts that claim 21 allegedly introduced a limitation that the original restriction was based on. Applicants have canceled claims 10-16 and 21, without prejudice.

Furthermore, the Office rejects claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office asserts that the limitation "and attendance at the event is not limited to invited individuals only" is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. However, Applicants note that the specification clearly provides examples of events in which attendance at the event is not limited to invited individuals only. For example, paragraph 0004 discusses training events, such as exam prep course, bar review, etc. and paragraph 0019 lists illustrative

events such as a movie showing, an airplane flight, a shuttle service, etc., which are not events similar to weddings or parties that are typically limited to invited individuals. Similarly, paragraph 0005 discusses leads, online marketing, and/or the like, which are not generally required for events limited to invited individuals only. Still further, Applicants note that the specification makes no mention of limiting attendance to any of these events to only those individuals that have been invited. To this extent, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would readily understand that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, understood that attendance at the events described therein are not necessarily limited to invited individuals only. As a result, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0156787 (Jameson) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0200192 (Bell) and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0128934 (Shaer). Applicants submit that the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, and Shaer teaches or suggests “analyzing the event and, based on the analyzing, generating a report to indicate an effectiveness of marketing the event and a quality of the event” as claimed therein. The Office asserts that Jameson allegedly teaches the analysis system of claim 1 (canceled claim 4) and cites to paragraph [0116] of Jameson for support. See Final Office Action, page 6.

However, Applicants contend that neither this cited paragraph nor the remaining portions of Jameson teach or suggest the analyzing of claim 1. In paragraph [0116], Jameson teaches a task generation tool to “facilitate the development of a task list or a to-do list”. To this extent, Jameson merely provides for developing a list of tasks for a particular event. Applicants assert that developing a task list for an event does not teach or suggest analyzing the event and, based on the analyzing, generating a report to indicate an effectiveness of marketing the event and a quality of the event as provided in claim 1. Further, Applicants assert that neither Bell nor Shaer remedy this deficiency of Jameson.

As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1 and claims 2-3 and 5-9, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, and Shaer.

With respect to claim 17, Applicants submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, and Shaer teaches or suggests program code for integrating event management that includes all the features claimed therein. For example, for reasons that should be clear from the discussion of the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, and Shaer above, Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, and Shaer fails to teach or suggest the program product of claim 17, including program code, which enables a computer system to analyze the event and, based on the analysis, generate a report to indicate an effectiveness of the marketing and a quality of the event including all the features claimed therein. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 17 and claims 18-20, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable

over the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, and Shaer. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Furthermore, the Office rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jameson in view of Bell and further in view of Shaer and further in view of the Office Notice. Applicants note that the Office relies on its rejection of independent claim 17, from which this claim depends. To this extent, Applicants incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to claim 17. Further, Applicants submit that the proposed addition of the Office Notice, even if, *arguendo*, proper, fails to address the deficiencies discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary and/or in a related patent application, either of which may seek to obtain protection for claims of a potentially broader scope.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all pending rejections of the claims. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the

application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elaine Chi/

Elaine Chi, Reg. No. 61,194  
Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14th Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile

Dated: April 4, 2010